

MINUTES

REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION COUNCIL

April 9, 2015

The Regional Transportation Council (RTC) met on Thursday, April 9, 2015, at 1 pm in the Transportation Council Room of the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG). The following members or representatives were present: Douglas Athas, Loyl Bussell (representing Brian Barth), Carol Bush, Mike Cantrell, Sheri Capehart, Rudy Durham, Andy Eads, Charles Emery, Mark Enoch, Gary Fickes, Sandy Greyson, Mojoy Haddad, Roger Harmon, Vonciel Jones Hill, Clay Jenkins, Ron Jensen, Jungus Jordan, Sheffie Kadane, Stephen Lindsey, Brian Loughmiller, David Magness, Scott Mahaffey, Matthew Marchant, Ray Smith (representing Maher Maso), Mark Riley, Kevin Roden, Amir Rupani, Mykol Woodruff (representing Kelly Selman), Mike Taylor, Stephen Terrell, Oscar Trevino, William Velasco II, Oscar Ward, Bernice J. Washington, Duncan Webb, Kathryn Wilemon, and Zim Zimmerman.

Others present at the meeting were: Vickie Alexander, Bruce Arfsten, Gustavo Baez, Greg Baker, Melissa Baker, Paul Ballard, Berrien Barks, Carli Baylor, Bryan Beck, Natalie Bettger, Brandi Bird, Brandy Bissland, Alberta Blair, Shauna Bowman, Tanya Brooks, Ron Brown, John Brunk, Mo Bur, Michael Burbank, Chris Burkett, Jarrett Burley, Marrk Callier, Angie Carson, Dave Carter, Juan Contreras, Michael Copeland, Hal Cranor, Jason Crawford, Mike Curtis, Clarence Daugherty, Jerry Dittman, Chris Dyer, Chad Edwards, Traci Enna, Steve Farco, Brittney Farr, Kevin Feldt, Brian Flood, David Gattis, Bob Golden, Scott Gordon, Christie Gotti, Gary Graham, Scott Hall, Tony Hartzel, Suzie Heap, Rebekah Hernandez, Robert Hinkle, Jodi Hodges, David Hosseiny, Jessie Huddleston, Sholeh Karimi, Kate Kerr, Dan Kessler, Karen Khan, Ken Kirkpatrick, Chris Klaus, Paul Knippel, Dan Lamers, April Leger, Ray Leszczynski, Sonny Loper, Paul Luedtke, Stanford Lynch, Keith Manoy, Chad McKeown, Michael Miles, Cliff Miller, Nancy Mitchell, Cesar Molina Jr., Erin Moore, Michael Morris, Mark Nelson, Mickey Nowell, Vaughn Parker, Maurice Pittman, John Polster, James Powell, Vercie Pruitt-Jenkins, Richard Randall, Cesar Razo, Chris Reed, Bill Riley, Kyle Roy, Greg Royster, Moosa Saghian, Steve Salin, Russell Schaffner, Kenneth Schoen, Cathy Scott, Lori Shelton, Randy Skinner, Jim Sparks, Melissa Stephens, Rick Stopfer, Jahnae Stout, Sarah Stubblefield, Vic Suhm, Darrell Thompson, Matt Thompson, Don Treude, Lauren Trimble, Frank Turner, Jimmy Vrzalik, Mitzi Ward, Kendall Wendling, Sandy Wesch, Elizabeth Whitaker, Billy Mack Williams, Amanda Wilson, Brian Wilson, Bruce Wood, Ed Wueste, and Susan Young.

1. **Approval March 12, 2015, Minutes:** The minutes of the March 12, 2015, meeting were approved as submitted in Reference Item 1. Sheffie Kadane (M); Kathryn Wilemon (S). The motion passed unanimously.
2. **Consent Agenda:** The following item was included on the Consent Agenda.
 - 2.1. **2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program Modifications:** A motion was made to approve March 2015 out-of-cycle revisions to the 2015-2018 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) provided in Reference Item 2.1.1 and May 2015 revisions to the 2015-2018 TIP provided in Reference Item 2.1.2.

Sherri Capehart (M); Bernice J. Washington (S). The motion passed unanimously.
3. **Orientation to Agenda/Director of Transportation Report:** Mayor Douglas Athas presented members with a challenge coin for IH 635E as a token of efforts to implement the project. Michael Morris reminded members that it was Stand Up 4 Transportation day.

He noted that staff would later present information regarding the next Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grant program for potential opportunities to advance projects in the region. In addition, he discussed a request for action supporting Glen Whitley's position regarding maintenance funds. Mr. Whitley often reminds members that as the region has moved forward with toll roads and tolled managed lanes, the inventory of roadways that the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) maintains decreases, but the percentage of maintenance funds that are allocated to the region should not be artificially lowered because the region has opted for toll facilities. Staff requested approval for the Regional Transportation Council (RTC) Chair to send a letter to TxDOT indicating that the accounting system for the inventory of maintenance funds should be on the full inventory of major roadways and that regions that build toll facilities should not receive a discounted amount of maintenance funds. He noted that a correction to a particular formula could pay dividends in several different State formulas. This position leads to a policy question about whether maintenance funds should go to maintenance or if the RTC wishes to flex the funds to capacity improvements. Details can be negotiated in the future. A motion was made to approve the RTC Chair to send a request to the Chair of the Texas Transportation Commission that roadways in the Dallas-Fort Worth region should not be discounted because the region has opted to participate in a toll initiative. Jungus Jordan (M); Andy Eads (S). The motion passed unanimously.

Mr. Morris also noted that the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) is awaiting air quality conformity approval from the Federal Highway Administration and that staff will provide an update to members in the future. Details were available in Electronic Item 3.1. Current air quality funding opportunities for vehicles were provided in Electronic Item 3.2, and information on the 2015 ozone season was provided in Electronic Item 3.3. In addition, comments from the March 9-April 7, 2015, online public input opportunity were provided at the meeting in Reference Item 3.8. Mr. Morris also discussed This is It – Passenger Transit, a phrase coined for staff in an effort to work with the transit industry, the business community, and other businesses that are seeking public transit as a part of their business plans. He also noted the upcoming Freeway Incident Management Executive level Course on May 13, 2015. Regarding passenger rail options, Mr. Morris discussed efforts to have a passenger rail vehicle manufacturing facility locate in the region and the Fort Worth Transportation Authority's (The T's) procurement process under the Buy America provisions. RTC east/west equity updates were provided in Electronic Item 3.4.1 and Electronic Item 3.4.2, and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act updates were provided in Electronic Item 3.4.3 and Electronic Item 3.4.4. Recent correspondence was provided in Electronic Item 3.5, recent news articles in Electronic Item 3.6, and recent press releases in Electronic Item 3.7. Partner progress reports were provided at the meeting.

4. **State/Federal Legislative Update and Proposed Action from the Regional Transportation Council Legislative Workshop:** Amanda Wilson provided a federal legislative update. She noted that the federal transportation bill expires in May, as well as authority to spend funds from the Highway Trust Fund. One option being discussed is the Grow America Act totaling \$478 billion over six years proposed to be funded by taxing overseas earnings of United States companies, but neither the House nor Senate has introduced this as a bill. It is likely that work will begin on an extension of the federal surface transportation bill. In addition, the Administration announced a new round of Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery (TIGER) grants. Required pre-applications were due by May 4 and final applications are due by June 5. Entities interested in letters of support from the North Central Texas Council of Governments (NCTCOG) should contact Rebekah Hernandez by May 15. Ms. Wilson also provided an update regarding the 84th Texas Legislature, beginning with the Regional Transportation Council (RTC)

Legislative Program to actively pursue. Related to identifying additional transportation revenue is the State budget. HB 1 has passed the House floor and includes \$209.7 billion over the biennium, with a \$1.6 billion increase in transportation funding over the last biennium. Contingency funds for the Low-Income Repair and Replacement Assistance Program (LIRAP)/Local Initiative Projects (LIP) and the Texas Emissions Reduction Plan (TERP) are possible should additional legislation be passed related to general revenue dedicated accounts. The Senate Finance Committee approved HB 1 with a slightly smaller increase of \$1.3 billion for transportation and full funding within the article with new revenue that LIRAP/LIP and TERP will generate during the biennium. Additional revenue bills of interest include SB 5 and SJR 5 which would move a portion of the motor vehicles sales tax to the State Highway Fund for non-tolled roadway projects. HJR 13 and HB 13 have not moved but include moving a portion of the general state sales tax revenue as more stable source. Additional bills related to diversions and local vehicle registration has also been discussed, and staff will continue to monitor activities. Related to high-speed rail, SB 1601 has passed out of the Senate Transportation Committee. This bill would prohibit a rail company from exercising the power of eminent domain for high-speed rail through State authority. There may be some federal authority that could be used but this could impact the high-speed rail project from Dallas to Houston. In addition, HB 3918 was heard but left pending. This bill would prohibit the issuance of bonds for high-speed rail construction. Staff will be monitoring these bills closely. She also flagged an additional bill of interest regarding the Red River Navigability Study. HB 1907 has been sent to the House Transportation Subcommittee but has not had any action. A rider in HB 1 includes a contingency rider of \$2.5 billion for the study should HB 1907 pass. This was presented to the RTC who committed to participate in the study.

Michael Morris reviewed discussion from the RTC Legislative Workshop held prior to the meeting. He discussed the RTC priority to advance public-private partnership tools for the IH 635 project, noting that this priority was in danger of not being approved by the Legislature. Staff met with legislators in Austin to brainstorm on possible ideas. Mr. Morris noted that for the biennium there could be between \$6.8 billion and \$7.6 billion for transportation for the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), which totals approximately \$3.5 billion annually statewide. As the State seems to be moving back towards a pay-as-you-go system, RTC has discussed the desire to also move away from tolling. Proposed action from the workshop is to communicate to the Legislature the RTC's appreciation and interest in moving towards pay-as-you-go. Reference Item 4.1, provided at the meeting and discussed at the workshop, referenced the use of tolls used in the absence of sufficient transportation funding on mega projects. The Grand DFW Tolled Managed Lane Compromise is conditional on the Legislature moving forward with additional transportation funding of the magnitude discussed and that the current existing tools are maintained. The compromise would allow planning for improvements to IH 635 to advance through a public-private partnership. The request does not change the priority of the Southern Gateway which would still be implemented first through the current funding commitment on the project. The request would be to trade in two of the three previously approved CDA projects for one new CDA project. If the request is approved, RTC would work with its legislative delegation in the region to get consensus locally as this initiative moves forward, and the RTC would decide in the future which two projects would be traded. In addition, the RTC would use new revenue allocated to the RTC to remove peak period tolls for high-occupancy vehicle (HOV) users of TxDOT/RTC tolled managed lanes projects in the region. Some of the new revenue allocated by the Legislature is anticipated to be received each year from the State and placed into an account to pay 100 percent of the cost of the HOV users during the peak period. If approved, staff would then begin to determine if non-mega projects in Mobility 2040 can be funded with options other than tolling. Approval would also

send a message to those currently deliberating on Southern Gateway and LBJ that HOV users would not be tolled and then this HOV policy could be applied to all the other corridors.

Amanda Wilson noted that NCTCOG staff rely on the policy board to communicate to elected legislators. This is a critical time and they need to hear from the local officials regarding the impact of this legislation on the Dallas-Fort Worth region. Reference Item 4.2, provided at the meeting, asks members to identify if they are comfortable communicating with legislators on behalf of RTC items. Members have been receiving e-mails related to bills of interest to the RTC that are being heard in committee hearings and members were asked for their assistance.

Clay Jenkins discussed the two projects he believed would be traded, Southern Gateway and Loop 9. He asked if the plan would be to build the Southern Gateway on time and on budget, but without the tolling component. Related to Loop 9, he noted that it seems as if the only way to get the project built is to use a comprehensive development agreement (CDA) for toll bridges. The project opens up 50,000 acres of undeveloped land in southeastern Dallas County for needed jobs. Mr. Morris discussed the Southern Gateway project. TxDOT has indicated that a concession will not be used on the Southern Gateway because it does not produce enough revenue and has decided to build through a design build contract. The strategy is to ensure that the Southern Gateway project proceeds first. The first phase is estimated at approximately \$500 million. When presented two months ago, this was entirely an RTC cost. If the State wishes to go through a design-build process and if the Legislature approved the magnitude of money discussed, the first increment of revenue would go to the Southern Gateway to close any financial gap necessary to move ahead with the project. If approved, the region will proceed with Southern Gateway first and start banking money to proceed with what is currently the next priority in Dallas County, the LBJ project. Mr. Morris also discussed the Loop 9 project and the current strategy to move ahead on the environmental document, using the \$50-100 million that exists on the project to build a frontage road system. A toll component is not considered feasible and the project is not being environmental cleared for a toll component. If the Legislature were to provide the \$3.5 billion statewide and the fair share to the region, there would be no reason to introduce tolls on the project, and Loop 9 will continue to be funded through the annual allocations. Mr. Jenkins expressed concern that members were being asked to approve a trade for projects that were not identified in Reference Item 4.1, provided at the meeting. He noted that if southern Dallas County is trading its two CDAs for a future promise that projects benefiting citizens in southern Dallas County will be built over time, he would like this promise to be memorialized before there is a vote. He discussed the value of the Southern Gateway project, noting that the region would not have fought for it if there were no value. In addition, Mr. Jenkins asked the third project that could be considered for trade. Mr. Morris noted that it was the IH 820 project in Tarrant County. Mr. Jenkins expressed that he did not believe the region would trade something in Tarrant County to build a project in Dallas County based on past history. Mr. Morris noted that if the RTC is required to pay 100 percent of the cost for HOV users on the facility it may not be possible for Southern Gateway to proceed first. If a partnership is possible, RTC would use the first increase in revenue to ensure that the Southern Gateway is implemented first without having to use 100 percent of its money to pay for HOV users. The attempt is to get Southern Gateway back to a 50/50 deal where TxDOT and RTC could possibly save \$100 million of your money on Southern Gateway for some other purpose instead of paying 100 percent of the cost on Southern. Mr. Jenkins asked if NCTCOG staff had discussed this with elected officials or anyone representing the cities and counties that would be impacted by Loop 9. Mr. Morris noted that being in the midst of the current legislative session does not allow for the regular planning timeframes.

He noted that he has discussed the compromise with the RTC Chair, Mayor Douglas Athas, and Vonciel Jones Hill the Transportation Chair of Dallas. Mark Enoch discussed the three contributors when the managed lanes were set up, TxDOT, Dallas County, and Dallas Area Rapid Transit (DART). DART invested approximately \$60 million and the payback was planned when the capital cost had been recovered. Given the fact that this is being modified, he asked about the repayment of that investment. Mr. Morris discussed the urgency created by the legislative session. He noted that this initiative was an attempt to create a conversation with the Legislature to advance the ability of IH 635 to proceed. Mr. Enoch noted that it seemed as though staff is indicating that there is not time to work out the details immediately and that there are things that RTC must work on if this or some form of this deal is accepted by the Legislature to ensure that previous commitments are maintained for those who invested in the lanes. Mr. Morris noted that he was correct. Vonciel Jones Hill noted that she wished to hear clearly on the public record that the trade will not adversely affect the Southern Gateway, it will still proceed first. The financing method is different but financing is not being taken away. Mr. Morris noted that it increases the chances of Southern Gateway to proceed first because it creates an opportunity for the first installment of TxDOT funds to go to the Southern Gateway. It reduces the magnitude of money that RTC may have to use on the project. It also permits the region the opportunity to not toll any HOV users on any of the HOV systems across the entire region. As the Legislature moves forward and the pendulum moves more towards pay-as-you-go, the RTC must send a message that it will also move away from tolling. Mega projects will still need a toll component, while smaller projects may proceed with pay-as-you-go funding. Vonciel Jones Hill noted she was willing to make the motion if there is a way to wordsmith so that it is clear that the Southern Gateway goes first. Douglas Athas noted that IH 635 is a mega project that ties into the existing portion of LBJ north. He discussed the importance of the project to development along the existing portions of IH 635, as well as residents and businesses in the entire northeast portion of the region. It is not being asked that the project move ahead of the line, but that the toll opportunities are used to do the most for the region. Bernice J. Washington noted that the RTC must be willing to put something forward that the Legislature is willing to accept. Mr. Jenkins reiterated the importance of Loop 9 to those in southern Dallas County and northern Ellis County and his concern that the RTC was making a decision on such short notice. Carol Bush also discussed the short notice and the inability to discuss the decision with elected officials in regions. Duncan Webb noted that Reference Item 4.1 mentioned the elimination of tolling on HOV lanes during peak periods and asked for clarification. Mr. Morris noted that the RTC policy has never paid the HOV costs in the off-peak period so this would only impact the peak period with no cost for HOV users to travel during that time. He also clarified that no decision was being made at the meeting regarding which two projects would be traded. Mr. Jenkins noted past discussions on Loop 9 and concern that future funding is not guaranteed from the Legislature, noting that any assurance that could be given that RTC is looking towards the building of Loop 9 would be appreciated. Mr. Morris noted that this policy is contingent on the fact that the Legislature funds the State at \$3.5 billion, that the region gets its fair share, and that it is able to keep its current tools. This partnership is an effort to send a message that tolling tools should be used for mega projects and if funding is allocated at this level, Loop 9 would not need tolled grade separated thoroughfare bridges. Mr. Jenkins asked about the financial commitment for the Loop 9 project. Mr. Morris noted that if the region receives its fair share every year there would be no reason for the region to toll incremental grade separations when funding could be requested through the RTC. If approved, the projects would then be determined at a future meeting. Discussion occurred regarding whether the western subregion would be willing to trade IH 820. Chair Mike Cantrell asked if members would be in favor of wasting the CDA on a project that is not going to use the option to the detriment of a mega project. A

motion was made to approve the Grand DFW Tolloed Managed Lane Compromise provided in Reference Item 4.1. Vonciel Jones Hill (M); Bernice J. Washington (S).

Andy Eads asked if staff had the opportunity to look at the revenue assumptions that were used for the TIFIA loan and asked if there would be any negative impact if the HOV reduction was implemented. Mr. Morris noted that there should be no impact to IH 35E. In addition, if there were negative impacts the RTC would not proceed because the assumption is that no projects will be negatively impacted and that existing priorities will not change. Matthew Marchant asked if staff viewed the HOV 2+ as critical to the structure of the deal, noting that he would like to better understand some of the details. Mr. Morris noted that key legislators are looking at options to include no CDAs in current bills. In discussions with those legislators, staff asked if other options would be considered. The conversation progressed and staff worked to determine RTC could send the message that elected officials are willing to move away from tolling projects. Since the HOV policy is complicated, it was suggested that this would be a good signal and also an effort to simplify the HOV policy by saying SOV users pays and HOV users do not pay during the peak period. This would also help get the Southern Gateway and other projects across the goal line. He noted that a lot of work must be done to look at the magnitude of the cost and the payback schedule. There may be unintended consequences that mean RTC cannot follow through with the compromise, but staff was attempting to bring something to the Legislature. Mr. Marchant noted that it would have been appropriate for staff to provide the information in Reference Item 4.1 by e-mail as soon as possible to allow time for review by members. Mr. Morris noted that he did not discuss the options until the workshop, held prior to the meeting, to avoid members being inundated with media questions prior to receiving a briefing. A workshop was held so that the item was not forced during the meeting. Mr. Marchant noted that details about the discussion topics at the workshop would have helped him make a decision whether or not the workshop should have been a priority compared to his other priorities arising out of elected service. Mr. Webb asked if the CDA component and the HOV component of the deal could be separated. He expressed concern regarding the financial implications of going from paying 50 percent to 100 percent, where those funds would come from, how it will impact funding in the area, and how the allocation is made. Chair Cantrell noted that members have heard that staff is trying to create a partnership situation with legislators that are not comfortable with CDAs in an effort to move them into a position they can justify supporting with the understanding that the north Texas region is going to back off of the tolls. Mr. Morris made a technical correction to Reference Item 4.1, adding a 5th statement noting that RTC reserves the right to review components of the proposal if unintended negative consequences are determined. Charles Emery motioned to call the question, which was approved unanimously. A vote was taken on the original motion. Clay Jenkins, Matthew Marchant, and Carol Bush were opposed. The motion passed.

5. **Mobility 2040**: Dan Lamers provided an overview of the purpose, schedule, and new initiatives being considered for the region's next long-range transportation plan, Mobility 2040. One of the primary responsibilities of the Metropolitan Planning Organization is the development and maintenance of a metropolitan transportation plan (MTP). The last comprehensive update of the MTP was in 2011 with the adoption of Mobility 2035. Since that time, Mobility 2035 has gone through an update in 2013 and an amendment in 2014. Efforts are now underway for Mobility 2040. This document is the blueprint for the region's transportation system over the next 20-year timeframe and it guides the expenditure of federal and State funds. He noted that as conversations that impact the allocation of funding occur, it is important to include those projects in the MTP and ensure that the recommendations have no unintended consequences. New elements for Mobility 2040

include the new 2040 horizon planning year, an additional 3.7 million in population and 2 million in jobs, legislative action from the current legislative session, and federal planning requirements. Staff will move ahead with current financial assumptions and then spend time over the summer reviewing the implications of federal and State legislative results. He highlighted additional policy considerations such as the evaluation and revaluation of the balance between transit and roadway, priced facilities and free roads, the increasing role of technology, last mile connections, etc. The theme of Mobility 2040 will be balance, particularly with regard to the balance between priced facilities and free facilities. The schedule for development of Mobility 2040 was reviewed, including public involvement and final adoption of Mobility 2040 anticipated in March 2016. Following the current legislative session, a workshop will likely be scheduled in early summer to begin discussions, particularly regarding funding and balance. He also flagged an infographic provided at the meeting as Reference Item 5. Include in the infographic is a link to the survey for individuals to weigh in on the future of transportation. The link is also available at www.nctcog.org/survey2040.

6. **Innovative Revenues/Financial Backstop Update:** Ken Kirkpatrick briefed members on the status of Regional Transportation Council (RTC) financial backstop commitments and associated risks, including an inventory of projects with innovative revenue streams. He noted that discussions in Item 4 may impact some of the analysis presented, and that staff will incorporate information into future updates. Three categories of projects were presented: managed lane/revenue sharing projects, loan/funding swap initiatives, and financial backstop projects. Related to managed lane/revenue sharing projects, Mr. Kirkpatrick reminded members that in some cases the public sector owns the revenue and in other cases the public sector shares in the revenue. Managed lane/revenue sharing projects for which the public sector owns the revenue include the DFW Connector, estimated at approximately \$350 million over 40 years and IH 30, estimated at approximately \$240 million over 20 years. For IH 35E, a Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (TIFIA) loan is being pursued and revenue from the project will repay the loan with any additional revenues remaining on the corridor. The SH 183/SH 114/Loop 12 project has been awarded by the Texas Transportation Commission and portions of SH 114 are under construction. The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) will be submitting a TIFIA loan for the project so any revenues generated from the project are pledged to repay the loan. Projects in which the public sector potentially shares the revenue include LBJ and the North Tarrant Express. If these projects reach a certain milestone and revenue exceeds certain limits, TxDOT and RTC would then share in the revenue with the private-sector partner. Based on initial conversations, revenue in this category is anticipated to be negligible. For the PGBT Eastern Extension, revenues are coming in and anticipated to be approximately \$350 million through 2035. The first \$124 million goes to Dallas County for repayment of the loan. Related to funding swap initiatives is the \$140 million North Texas Tollway Authority/TxDOT State Infrastructure Bank loan buyout that will be repaid over the next 15 years. The first few payments have been received. Another initiative was the FM 156/Fort Worth/Burlington Northern Santa Fe rail relocation for approximately \$50 million. Funds will be repaid with Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) funds, subject to the FAA annual allocation. There is a moderate risk regarding this repayment. Another project is the \$30 million IH 35W loan for the North Tarrant Express project. Staff is working to resolve this issue and will present information at a future RTC meeting. For the IH 30 and FM 1171 Pass-Through Finance projects, the funds are coming in and most of the money has been committed. Approximately 25 percent remains uncommitted and is in a pool of funds to be allocated to projects based on approval of the Trinity Parkway. In addition, the RTC advanced \$85 million for engineering on the Trinity Parkway project and those funds are largely unspent. Staff will continue to track this item as Trinity Parkway discussions

continue. Denton County also loaned \$57 million in Regional Toll Revenue funds on the LBJ project for right-of-way, which has been repaid. Mr. Kirkpatrick also discussed financial backstop projects for SH 360 and LBJ. Related to SH 360, the backstop includes operations/ maintenance and the project loan. In addition, there are anticipated revenues. Recently, TxDOT conditionally awarded the SH 360 project to the constructor. Two things that mitigate the RTC risk on the project is that the bid came back permitting a full four lanes to US 287 increasing the initial revenue. In addition, the operations and maintenance costs on a unit basis for the first 15 years came in lower than anticipated. Staff believes these two things lower the RTC risk for this project. In addition, the LBJ project has two backstop items. One is the repayment of \$90 million which is complete and has been allotted to SH 183. Also, there is a backstop of \$100 million on LBJ, of which \$40 million was utilized for the IH 35E/LBJ Interchange Y Connection and \$60 million is now available to the Dallas County pool of funds. Staff will continue to monitor related items as the legislative session ends and update members accordingly.

7. **Roadway Leverage and System Development:** Michael Morris highlighted a document prepared in response to a request by Jungus Jordan responding to the importance of system and leveraging, provided in Electronic Item 7. Members often discuss the benefit of building a transportation system versus simply building projects in the Dallas-Fort Worth (DFW) region. In order to accomplish this goal, commitments must sometimes be leveraged. Jungus Jordan discussed a chart provided at the RTC Legislative Workshop held prior to the meeting, noting how the region was able to increase capacity beyond what it could have done by using toll roads to pay for free roads. In addition, Mr. Morris highlighted a slide showing that the DFW region was the 32nd most congested region. Compared to other congested areas, the DFW region has benefited from leveraging projects and experiences less congestion than other cities highlighted despite its size. Staff noted that members would be provided the transit piece, system leverage piece, navigation data slide showing congestion, as well as the slide from the workshop by e-mail. In addition, RTC Chair Mike Cantrell requested that staff send the attachments to transportation committees in both the House and Senate and also to the Dallas County legislative delegation.

8. **"Characteristics of Premium Transit Services": An application for the Dallas Fort Worth Region:** Michael Morris discussed his service on the Transportation Research Board Academy of Science committee over the last three years called "Characteristics of Premium Transit Services." This initiative looked at what defines premium service and the elements of rail/bus that accomplishes premium service. Surveys were completed across the country and transit services were tested in three different communities. Mr. Morris viewed the current managed lane system noting that the region now has the potential ability to introduce transit service onto the express lanes. These lanes have guaranteed speeds and it may be possible to introduce guaranteed transit fares as a way to encourage transit usage on the managed lanes. Once construction is completed on IH 30, staff would like to work with the transit agencies regarding a pilot study to determine what would be the "characteristics of premium transit service" if introduced in the corridor. He discussed the park-and-ride lots in the area and the new federal highway carpooling application, noting that these could potentially be integrated as new "characteristics of premium transit services." The pilot study would include payment to the transit agencies to run service on IH 30 and test guaranteed transit service, utility of the park-and-ride lots, integration of both carpooling and transit, and use the revenues from the corridor to help innovative subsidizing of service. Results of the pilot test could potentially be integrated into other corridors. For example on IH 35W to the Alliance area, there has been interest in dedicated transit in express lanes to preserve and maintain employment. There is not necessarily a parallel rail corridor in that area, but in the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act

(TIFIA) application for IH 35W an innovative transit component was committed to the federal government. Options could be considered for facilities with express elements and allow cities to potentially join the transit agencies as part of the system. Staff will work with the transit agencies and potentially bring back a proposal in the January timeframe.

9. **Progress Reports:** Regional Transportation Council attendance was provided in Reference Item 9.1, Surface Transportation Technical Committee attendance and minutes were provided in Electronic Item 9.2, and the current Local Motion was provided in Electronic Item 9.3.
10. **Other Business (Old or New):** There was no discussion on this item.
11. **Future Agenda Items:** There was no discussion on this item.
12. **Next Meeting:** The next meeting of the Regional Transportation Council is scheduled for Thursday, May 14, 2015, 1:00 pm, at the North Central Texas Council of Governments.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 pm.